The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 3
No. 5

SEPTEMBER
1913

SUFFRAGISTS' EXAGGERATED CLAIMS REFUTED

THE FAILURE OF SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO

THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN INDEPENDENT OF "VOTE"

PROTESTANTISM AND SUFFRAGE

CALIFORNIA'S EVOLUTION

A PROBLEM TO SOLVE WITHOUT THE VOTE

SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM

CATHOLIC OPPOSITION TO SUFFRAGE

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS DIVISION OF PERIODICALS
JAN 29 1914

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburg, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Eli Whitney, New Haven, Conn.
Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.
General Sec'y, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. James Codman, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Arthur Dunn, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbot, Dayton, O.
Miss Anna Dayton, Trenton, N. J.
Miss Jane U. Rutherfoord, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. Brookes Brown, Burlington, Vt.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

Office: 209 Pearl St., Hartford.
President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Charles C. Beach, Miss Martha J. Wilkinson.
Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cook.
Secretary, Mrs. Walter S. Schulz, Hartford.

ILLINOIS

President, Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. R. J. Oglesby, Mrs. James M. Walker, Mrs. T. B. Blackstone.
Treasurer, Miss J. C. Fairfield, Dearborn Avenue, Chicago.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. George W. Kretzinger.

IOWA COMMITTEE

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MARYLAND

Office: 1203 North Charles St., Baltimore.
President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Halsup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Mrs. Michael Wild.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Claude Hall.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

MAINE COMMITTEE

Secretary, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland; Mrs. Charles S. Ogden, Mrs. James P. Baxter, Mrs. Clarence H. Corning, Mrs. F. A. Quimby; Miss Louisa Spring, Miss Catherine P. Talbot, Miss Hannah L. Talbot, Miss Mary King Longfellow, Miss Elinor S. Moody, Miss Marion Richmond Weeks, Mrs. John M. Glidden, Newcastle; Mrs. P. M. Blake, Bangor; Mrs. F. C. Robinson, Brunswick.

MASSACHUSETTS

Office: 615 Boylston St., Boston.
President, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Vice-President, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Recording Secretary, Miss E. C. Post.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Boston.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Miss Stella Ford.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Ave., Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 201 East State St., Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Dayton.
President, Mrs. Edward Yarde Breese.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Alexander F. Jamieson, Mrs. C. Ledyard Blair, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Cornelius Hook, Mrs. Thomas Craven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Joseph M. Forst.
Recording Secretary, Miss MacIlvaine.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Elizabeth R. Hendrickson.
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th St., New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

OHIO

President, Mrs. H. E. Talbot, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Joseph Crane, Dayton; Mrs. John M. Gundry, Cleveland; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. Frank Ray, Granville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 So. Fifteenth St., Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Mrs. Frank Samuel, Mrs. William W. Birdsall, Miss Grace Falkner, Miss Sophy Dallas Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Brinton Coxe.
General Secretary and Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. Brookes Brown.
Vice-President, Mrs. George W. Wales.
Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Buckham, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.
Executive Committee, Mrs. G. G. Benedict, Mrs. Addison B. Buell, Mrs. Merritt D. Chittenden, Miss Bertha Terrill.

VIRGINIA

President, Miss Jane M. Rutherfoord.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William F. Gray.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Hunsdon Cary, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. James Lyons.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell, 1714 Grove Ave., Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

President, Mrs. Arthur W. Dunn.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Miss Jane Riggs, Miss Mollie Eliot Seawell, Mrs. George Wickersham, Miss Grace Denio Litchfield.
Treasurer, Miss McMullen.
Secretary, Miss C. L. Harrold, 2101 N St.

WISCONSIN

Madison Branch.
President, Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Joseph W. Hobbins.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Genevieve Mills, 222 Monona Avenue, Madison.

Exaggerated Claims of Suffragists in Congressional Hearing Disproved by Census Figures

IN a statement issued August 24, from the headquarters of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, the Suffragists are accused of giving misleading information to the House Committee on Rules in a hearing granted by the committee the previous week. The Anti-Suffragists particularly take exception to the claim of their opponents that they represented 4,000,000 women voters in the nine States where women have full suffrage—and Illinois.

"The Suffragists are influenced by the ardor of their cause," says the statement. "The Census Bureau is actuated only by the necessity of being scientifically accurate. The suffragists say their nine States have 4,000,000 women voters. The census shows that there are in the nine Suffrage States and Illinois a total of only 3,565,564 women 21 years old and over, and this total of females who have reached the voting age includes the ignorant, the foreign born, the unnaturalized, the negro, the Indian, and the Japanese and Chinese. The total number of native born white women of voting age in all these ten States is exactly 1,722,545. The foreign born total 882,783. Those of foreign or mixed parentage amount to 870,423.

"Consequently, under the limitations and restrictions put on the franchise in these States, it would be more than a liberal estimate to say that there are 2,500,000 women voters represented by the suffrage leaders. By this we mean 2,500,000 women of all conditions and nationalities who are able to vote. But the States which have granted the franchise to women estimate that, as a top figure, not more than two-thirds of the women of voting age and condition register, and not more than 70 per cent. of those who register go to the polls. Even this is a very high estimate. Two-thirds of 2,500,000 does not amount to 1,700,000. Consequently those women who arrogantly made to Congress the outrageous statement that they represented 4,000,000 women voters in reality voiced the opinions of far less than 2,000,000 women. Having behind them the support of less than 2,000,000 they claim 4,000,000, which is nearly half a million more than all the women of voting age in all the suffrage States.

"To the uncharitable the presentation of such figures to Congress by the Suffragists may seem the most flagrant mendacity. This organization, however, prefers to regard it as the hysterical exaggeration of a certain class of women who are carried away by the excitement of their unreasonable and unnatural effort to obtain the ballot for all women. It seems that the temptation to deal with the facts and figures in glittering generalities rather than with business-like precision is too strong for women who blunt their finer sensibilities in their attempts to enter the arena of politics.

"No more picturesque example of their inability to deal with a political situation could be found than that contained in their recent appearance before Mr. Henry's committee. Their line of attack was doubly absurd. In the first place they sought to influence Congress to interfere with the electorates of the States, a right which the Supreme Court of the United States has already decided is not vested in Congress. In the second place, they sought to strengthen their position through the use of grossly erroneous figures and statistics. Such a procedure cannot influence legislative action, but if it is permitted to go uncontradicted it may mislead public opinion. It is for these reasons that this organization considers it imperative to refute erroneous statements and to substitute accuracy for inaccuracy."

WOMEN 21 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER IN THE TEN SUFFRAGE STATES IN CENSUS OF 1910.

	Total.	White.	Native White.	Foreign or Mixed Parentage.	Foreign Born.	Negro.	Indian.	Oriental.
Colorado	213,425	209,195	122,780	43,605	42,810	3,861	284	85
California	671,386	654,305	308,000	174,435	171,870	6,936	4,209	5,936
Arizona	43,891	36,885	17,337	7,475	12,073	635	6,329	42
Idaho	69,818	68,543	40,258	17,043	11,242	187	1,031	57
Utah	85,729	84,588	26,838	32,901	24,849	313	747	81
Wyoming	28,840	27,932	15,648	6,209	6,075	494	376	38
Washington	277,727	271,828	141,260	59,732	70,836	1,697	2,904	1,298
Kansas	438,934	423,270	298,578	75,572	49,120	15,289	373	2
Oregon	168,323	166,191	104,149	32,273	29,769	443	1,323	306
Illinois	1,567,491	1,533,014	647,697	421,178	464,139	34,372	56	49
Total	3,565,564	3,475,751	1,722,545	870,423	882,783	64,227	17,632	7,954

The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York

Secretary, Mrs. Eli Whitney.....New Haven, Conn.

Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett..Roland Park, Baltimore

Vol. III. September, 1913 No. 5

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

CONSERVATIONISTS

It seems a pity that the editorial in the last number of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, making a dignified statement of the conservationist policy, should have elicited from the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw the following utterance quoted in the New York *Sun:*

Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, president of the National Woman Suffrage Association, says that she for one won't call the Antis "conservationists," as they request.

"They aren't 'conservationists,'" she said yesterday at her office, 505 Fifth Avenue, "they are 'destructionists.' If they are conservers why don't they begin their conservation at home instead of rushing about the country attacking us?

"What are they destructionists of? Of justice and freedom, of the dignity of womanhood. They advocate the theory of privilege instead of principle, of dependence instead of independence. They are destructionists in the real home because they forget that you cannot make a home of an inferior and a superior, of a master and a servant. You can have a home only when two who are equals decide to work together to build up a family.

"The Anti-Suffragists destroy the ideal of womanhood because they are always throwing mud at womanhood. They try to prove women lacking in honor, in character, in intelligence and in honesty. They gloat over every frailty, every little error. Don't you remember how they gloated over the one slit skirt in the suffrage parade? 'See!' they cried. 'They aren't fit to vote; now, are they?'

"They are like vultures looking for carrion. They revel in the dark and seamy side of human nature. They are always emphasizing the small and mean in women. You'd think they would have loyalty enough to their sex not to make us all out a set of fools."

These remarks have been widely commented upon throughout the country, the last paragraph especially seeming to have caused surprise in both Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists alike. The Syracuse *Herald* in an editorial August 13th says:

NOT NICE

"According to the New York *Sun,* Anna Howard Shaw, the suffrage leader, expresses this opinion of the Anti-Suffragists:

"'They are like vultures looking for carrion. They revel in the dark and seamy side of human nature. They are not conservationists. They are destructionists. What are they destructionists of? Of justice and freedom, of the dignity of womanhood.'

"Possibly Dr. Shaw didn't say it. If she did she ought to be ashamed of herself. The pretense that a good woman who does not aspire to vote and who is opposed to every effort to drag her sex into the turmoil and intrigue of American politics, is perforce an enemy of 'justice and freedom and the dignity of woman' is nonsense—and worse. American Suffragists should guard against imitating the intemperateness of their English sisters. There is more than one kind of violence. There is violence of speech, as well as of action. The one kind is nearly as offensive and degrading as the other. If American Suffragists reveal an indisposition to bear opposition patiently and good-naturedly they will only injure their cause."

And the New York *Evening Post* says:

"'They are like vultures looking for carrion. They revel in the dark and seamy side of human nature. They are not conservationists. They are destructionists. What are they destructionists of? Of justice and freedom, of the dignity of womanhood.'

"No, dear reader, this is not from a Government report on the white slave traffickers, but from Anna Howard Shaw's remarks on the Anti-Suffragists as given in the *Sun.* The Anti-Suffragists have just changed their name to conservationists, because they have probably realized that in this country at least people must be constructive instead of destructive, for something rather than against something. Dr. Shaw's torrid statements are fully as well justified as the original charge from Anti-Suffragist sources that the votes-for-women movement is largely propaganda by sex appeal. A foolish and bitter remark which has elicited replies in kind. A despicable cartoon, some time ago, portrayed a woman Anti-Suffragist in her comfortable home receiving a testimonial of thanks from a delegation of political thugs, white slave merchants and child-labor exploiters. The effect of that cartoon must have been distinctly hurtful to the suffrage cause. But it indicated how high partisan feelings run. The one thing that emerges from this animated debate is that women are not at all unfit for carrying on political controversy."

POSTPONING THE RECKONING

In some parts of this country where history and psychology are not much troubled about because, perhaps, they are somewhat new and undeveloped as yet, it is held that climaxes are easily prevented by instantly yielding to the demands of any insistent class. But this is only postponing a reckoning—not offering a solution. The French Revolution was not stayed by conciliation and the support of labor unions did not prevent dynamiting outrages in California. Sentimental sympathy encourages the growth of exaggerated demands and sooner or later a definite boundary must be fixed. Otherwise social, domestic and political anarchy is the outcome, as Miss Agnes Repplier says in her recent admirable article in the May *Atlantic:* "Our beliefs and our aspirations are most closely akin to the great enthusiasms which swept France before the Revolution: enthusiasms nobly born and profoundly unballasted, which promised unity and which gave confusion, which sought practical outlets and which fell, shattered by currents they could not control."

CONFERENCE BEFORE CHAIRMAN HENRY

Following the recent interview of Suffragists with Congressman Henry of the House Committee on Rules this statement was made to the press by The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage:

"No official or legislative importance can be attached to the action of Chairman Henry, of the House Rules Committee, in receiving here to-day, informally, a few delegates to the suffragist convention. The woman suffragists asked for a formal hearing before the Committee on Rules for the purpose of advocating the creation of a standing committee on woman suffrage. Mr. Henry has emphatically refused to grant such a hearing during the present session. His conference to-day, when the suffragists merely called on him personally, because he is the chairman of the Rules Committee, was for the purpose of arranging a definite date in December for a hearing of the suffragists before the Rules Committee during the regular session of Congress.

"In receiving the delegation of women personally to-day Mr. Henry clearly indicated by his action that his committee wants no suffrage committee, but he saved his reputation for politeness to women."

THE FAILURE OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO

This article by Rev. A. A. Berle, a Massachusetts clergyman, was not written for THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, *but appeared in the "Boston Transcript" under the heading: "A Tenderfoot in Suffrage Land—Strident Antagonisms in Colorado—Why It Is Determined to Recall Judge Lindsey." It is one of the most illuminating utterances it has ever been our privilege to print.*

A MASSACHUSETTS man visiting in Colorado in this year of our Lord will naturally find himself thinking about three things, woman suffrage, direct legislation and Judge Lindsey and the juvenile court. The hot battle for suffrage made by various groups of women engaged in the battle upon each other made it especially interesting to get first-hand opinions, in a State where for twenty years women have had the ballot, as to general results of that policy. Universal suffrage is probably inevitable throughout the entire land in spite of the occasional apparent set-backs for the cause, but it is none the less instructive to discuss the question with those whom it is *res adjudicata* and who can therefore have no interest in giving other than a thoroughly impartial survey of the situation.

Nobody in Colorado, so far as I know, has the slightest idea of abandoning the suffrage or of making any movement in that direction, so that Judge Lindsey's statement that the attack upon him comes from anti-suffrage advocates sounds, on the ground, somewhat silly and is evidently given for consumption elsewhere than in Colorado. But a somewhat extensive inquiry on the general effect of the woman vote in the politics of the State revealed some very curious facts. For many years the appeal for woman suffrage rested upon the assumption and the belief that the participation of women in public affairs would distinctly raise the tone of public discussion and bring greater purity into public administration. Nobody in Colorado now pretends that twenty years of such participation has had even the slightest result in this direction. Some things have been attempted and are undertaken which seem to recognize the political presence of women, but, broadly speaking, there has happened nothing in the State which might not have happened without voting women or which might have happened in other States where women do not vote.

EQUAL SUFFRAGE FAILS IN UPLIFT

In discussing this matter I had the privilege of getting the quotable opinion (most opinions on the subject not being quotable) of one of the most gifted women in Denver and one who has grown up with a wide knowledge and participation of public affairs and who is at this moment a member of the State Board for the Care of Dependent Children, Mrs. Richard Crawford Campbell, a graduate of Bryn Mawr and the daughter of ex-Senator Thomas M. Patterson, who has had exceptional opportunity, her father being the editor and proprietor of the *Rocky Mountain News,* of knowing both the inside and outside of public movements. Speaking on the general question Mrs. Campbell said:

"I am and have always been a firm believer in suffrage for women and I do not know anybody who seeks to alter it. But I am grateful that in Colorado we made our appeal not on the ground that we would purify political life, but simply on the human ground of natural rights. We did believe, of course, in our hearts, that women in public life would purify politics and would make for a higher moral and political standard. After twenty years, however, we are forced to admit that human nature as displayed by women is not different from that displayed by men and if the appeal had been made on the ground of uplift for politics it would have been disproved by the facts. The political alignments and the political activities of women do not differ essentially in kind or moral quality from those of the men, and while I am a firm believer in suffrage for women, the notion that this will purify political life any faster than human nature itself improves is a mistake."

This opinion I found to be general. It came not from those who did not believe in the political activities of women, but from those who do and who are active in the performance of their political duties. One of these, in fact, added a comment which, in view of the Lindsey battle which is now on, is significant. This person, also a woman, by the way a professional woman of Massachusetts antecedents, said: "In Denver a hysterical element has been added to our local politics which is discreditable to public life anywhere and I am sorry to say that the women for the most part supply the hysteria."

NO DIFFERENCE IN POLITICAL RESULTS

The facts moreover showed that this is an exact description of the situation. It seemed to be the opinion of these very women, certainly among the most intelligent and capable of the community, that Judge Lindsey had been the beneficiary of this hysterical addition to Denver politics and had employed it most effectively in his own behalf. This again, not from opponents of woman suffrage or from persons actively engaged in the Lindsey fight itself, a rather sensational affair, but from serious-minded students of the situation, anxious only for the public welfare.

Denver itself bore interesting witness to the accuracy of these views. Reform movements come and go with the same regularity that they do elsewhere. They are about as effective as elsewhere, meaning that there is a flareup and a flash in the pan and then the old crowd have possession of things much as before. The newspapers bore witness to exactly the same kind of struggle for municipal betterment which is being waged all over the land, and if the voting presence of the women has had any appreciable effect upon public life nobody seems to be aware of it, nor does the public life give any evidence of it. I found nobody, however, who cared to repeal the suffrage, even supposing such a thing possible, which it is not. All that was shown was that the total result of twenty years of woman suffrage in Colorado had been the addition of so many voters to the voting list with no appreciable difference in political results. Colorado has advanced as the rest of the country has advanced, but the agencies have been those of education, social maturity and growth in public spirit and civic pride.

PEOPLE OF CULTURE AND INTELLIGENCE

After my observation and experience with direct government in Oregon, where the fight for the higher education is still being waged between the enlightened forces, headed by President Campbell of the University of Oregon and the reactionaries, headed by the president of the Agricultural College, an institution with an eighth grade standard of admission persistently endeavoring to drag the education down to the second rate standard of such a school, I was hardly less interested to know what the Colorado people thought of initiative, referendum and other such instruments of political regeneration. The difficulties were the ones natural to the situation for getting opinions on this question. Nobody cared to impeach the intelligence of the Colorado people, and nobody with any sense would, for with her splendid institutions the State University at Boulder, Colorado College at Colorado Springs and the University of Denver in Denver itself, the State is making rapid strides forward in this direction, making it worth while for the New England college presidents to make their annual pilgrimage thither for prospective students. Both President Lowell and President Nichols of Dartmouth went out there during the last winter, and the point of view of these gentlemen and their conception of the state of development they supposed they were facing, as evidenced by their respective speeches, made an entertaining story. It may be said simply that persons who go to Colorado, especially to Denver, on the theory that the audience needs to be addressed

in words of one syllable, need education themselves. Harvard and Dartmouth and Yale and Bryn Mawr and Smith are too abundantly represented to make it worth while for any college president to trek half-way across the continent to deliver platitudes.

But while nobody would impeach Colorado intelligence, nobody that I talked with believed that with these new instruments of government any radical improvement in government either had been achieved or was to be expected. The fact that the State recently voted for two bills referred to it which were supposed to be mutually exclusive was ludicrous enough, but the fact that the direct legislationists have invented what they call a "safety clutch" to legislation, which is designed to prevent a referendum being taken upon it, is funny in the extreme. It seems that the "wicked interests" have learned how to use the referendum for what they don't like also, and there you are. In Oregon they are going to have a referendum this fall which will cost the State $75,000 or more to find out whether they will erect a building costing $100,000 at the State University. This hardly looks like economical government whatever else it is.

Lindsey and the Point of View

But if you want thrills in Denver all you have to do is to mention Judge Lindsey. He is the best of men, the worst of men, the idol of righteousness and the demon of iniquity! You can take your choice according to your company so that in the last analysis the question turns upon the character and intelligence of the authorities you consult.

While I was in Denver there appeared the appeal of the Woman's Protective League, whose object is "to secure the legal protection of girl children," and this is the society which is trying to secure the recall of Judge Lindsey. In the circular issued by this body on the Denver Juvenile Court which Judge Lindsey has made famous throughout the land, we are faced with the appalling charge that the Denver Juvenile Court under its present head is not only bad, but despicable, with reference to the particular matters which this society seeks to rectify. It contains the court record of the disposition of eighty-four cases of criminal assault upon young girls and the disposition of the cases seems to show that in this matter the court sadly needs overhauling. The temper of the document, which cannot be quoted in detail, may be judged from the following passage which occurs after a recital of some flagrant cases: "Had your daughter or sister been one of these girl victims, been ravished, ruined, become a mother, diseased or recruited for red light ranks; or some such girl had in turn, wrecked your son, debasing or diseasing him, would you then approve of these juvenile court methods of protecting rapists? Does it punish or deter? It does not." There is much more of the same sort and it is fair to state that it is accompanied in every case with facts and court record which at least call for explanation.

The relation of women to this particular court and its head is dealt with, which shows somewhat how the matter of women in public affairs is handled after twenty years' experience. "When men are asked to do something to put an end to these abuses of law and decency by the judge of the Denver Juvenile Court they say: "You women put him where he is and keep him there. It is a suffrage State. When you women want it stopped you can stop it. We are very willing to help you correct this mistake and remedy the consequences, but you must take the lead yourselves."

The reason why the facts have not been spread broadcast and why the situation, thus pronounced intolerable, persists is also explained in another sentence. "We are not publishing these facts in the newspapers to the scandal and disgrace of Denver, but are appealing directly to you," and this I found to be the explanation of the attitude of many men of eminence in public affairs, all of whom agreed that Judge Lindsey was neither by temperament, ability nor any other qualification the man to be at the head of the Juvenile Court.

Want Judge Lindsey Out

Astounded by this direct attack, I sought to find out how Judge Lindsey was held as a head of the Juvenile Court among the university-bred population, and was even more astounded to find that I could not run down any man who would give him unqualified indorsement, while the overwhelming opinion was such as to make the whole Lindsey story as the country knows it and his Juvenile Court one of the hugest gold bricks the country has ever had passed out to it. Again and again I asked why it was that, this being the case, Judge Lindsey could hold his place, and the uniform reply was that with all the advertising Denver had received through Lindsey it meant the equal advertising of the scandal and shame of Denver to tell the whole truth, and again, while Lindsey was a fraud the Juvenile Court as such would in proper hands be a good thing. Nobody wanted to assail the Juvenile Court. Everybody wanted Lindsey out!

Here again I sought enlightened opinion. Women officials, women physicians, some of the most capable and gifted women in Colorado, and the opinion against the judge was unanimous. Most of these simply confined their criticism to his administration, but almost all intimated other and more serious things. I asked a member of the Denver Civic League, an organization composed for the most part of young college men of public spirit, why they put Lindsey on their ticket and the reply was that they did not wish to appear to assail the court, that the women must take the lead, and that no suitable substitute was in sight. But he added that 70 per cent. of the body had no use for Lindsey. And there you are.

Massachusetts Methods Still Best

From all these strident antagonisms it is pleasant to turn to the other features of this queen city of the Rockies. Especially worth mentioning is the growing University of Denver, under the splendid and capable leadership of Chancellor Henry A. Buchtel, also a former governor of the State, now erecting a group of attractive buildings in University Park and making decided advances in the higher education and spreading light and leading throughout the city. Everywhere I found groups of Massachusetts people who had fled our climate and had integrated their New England traditions into their new homes. But with the predilections of twenty years in the direction of advanced legislation, I came back to the Bay State once more convinced, as I was when I struck the Oregonian paradise of pure democracy last year, believing that on the whole our Massachusetts methods still embody for the present the maturest wisdom for the successful operation of popular government.

JERSEY SUFFRAGE BILL NULLIFIED

(From the New York Evening Sun)

Trenton, N. J., Aug. 27.—The fight for women's suffrage in New Jersey will have to be started all over again, according to an opinion handed by Assistant Attorney-General Nelson B. Gaskell to Secretary of State David S. Crater, at the latter's request, declaring that inasmuch as the proposed women's suffrage amendment to the State Constitution, which was passed by the last Legislature, was not properly advertised within the time limit prescribed by the Constitution, the whole prospective legislation fails and a new start will have to be made.

The Constitution provides for the passage of a proposed constitutional amendment by two successive legislatures and then its submission to the votes of the people for adoption. This would have given the voters an opportunity to have accepted or rejected the amendment in 1914, after the next legislature had favorably passed upon it. Now, however, there is no chance for its coming before the people until 1915 at the earliest, providing, of course, the legislatures of 1914 and 1915 accept it.

The advertising of the women's suffrage resolution should have been commenced on August 4. The resolution, it is said, was filed with Governor Fielder's executive clerk among a large number of lost bills destined for the legislative morgue, in the State Library, and was not discovered until yesterday.

The Advancement of Women Independent of Suffrage

By Mrs. J. W. Birdsall

THE woman suffrage movement is now over sixty-four years of age, and so has run parallel with the great progress of women during that period. With characteristic modesty Suffragists claim that much of this progress is due to their movement, but we who are opposed to woman suffrage are confident that this is not so.

In 1848 a convention was called by a few women to consider the subject of the so-called "rights of women," at which was formulated a declaration of sentiments, and a list of grievances was adopted, twelve in number, which show conclusively that the organized movement was founded on sex antagonism and the idea that man is a conscious tyrant.

Two of these grievances will serve as samples of their whole contention:

1. "The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having as direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her."

12. "He has endeavored in every way that he could to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life."

These twelve grievances variously expressed are the contentions of the women to-day, and in view of the numerous privileges and immunities granted to them and the innumerable laws passed from time to time for their protection, and which are improved as fast as need is recognized and sane legislation permits, seem perfectly ridiculous.

No advantages have come to women through suffrage agitation, and we believe that the principles and results of it are at variance with any true advancement, either of women or of the State.

As civilization has advanced it has been more and more in the direction of specialization, and is thus exactly in line with the specialization of the functions of men and women which are of divine ordination.

Higher education for woman has been the special mark of her progress during this era, but the men and women who founded her colleges received neither aid nor inspiration from suffrage workers, who tried rather to "break down the sex barrier in education," as they to-day claim that "there is no sex in politics," and directed their efforts to obtaining entrance into men's universities and professional schools, rather than to the establishment of higher education. If the suffrage cause had any claim to consideration it should have called out enlightened discussions of great questions of public policy, but there are none such on record.

Divorce for several causes was the first legislation demanded, but even to-day they are demanding joint legislative action by men and women concerning divorce without making any suggestion of value as to what should be the trend of such action. However, the New York Suffrage Association has the following plank in its platform:

> "Until the enfranchisement of women, we call upon all women to oppose the idea of a uniform divorce law, because at the present time such a law would be made by men only and would necessarily discriminate against women!"

This uniform divorce law so carefully framed, so very necessary and so ardently desired by those who have the good of the nation at heart, has already been adopted by a number of States, but is determinedly opposed by these women on this whimsical ground.

Suffrage leaders claim that the changes in laws favorable to women were largely due to their demands, but in their published history the leaders say that one of the causes that led to their movement was "the discussion in several State Legislatures of the property rights of married women," showing that this agitation preceded their movement. In fact, this agitation began in 1837 and laws of this kind were passed in Rhode Island in 1844, four years before the suffrage organization, and by a number of other States in 1848-9.

The New York State Suffrage Association reported that in twenty-five years it had urged but three bills relating to anything but suffrage and that these did not originate with the association.

The professions were not opened to women through suffrage agitation as a dozen women were studying medicine in this country when the movement began, and in 1851 Mrs. Stanton wrote: "The trades and professions are all open to us." No writings concerning the condition or needs of the public have been published by those who are trying to use school suffrage as a stepping-stone to political ends. There is school suffrage in at least twenty-five States, but the small number of women who can be induced to vote is proving of no advantage and an expense, so that in two States, Connecticut and Ohio, its abolition has been proposed. On the day before the Connecticut House of Representatives defeated a suffrage amendment by a two to one majority there was a school election in Hartford in which only 95 women out of the 1,040 who had registered—and about 18,000 who might have done so—took the trouble to vote. Was it only a coincidence, or was it partly cause and effect?

Education as well as religious decency received a blow from the professed friends of woman's progress when the authoritative members of the suffrage association issued the Woman's Bible.

There have been no intelligent reasons given for such bills as the one urged by Suffragettes that the wife should have separate earnings and a valuation placed upon her services in the household. It is most fortunate that no amount of such pressure has made American Legislators look upon marriage as a business proposition, or consider it "progress" to place wives in the attitude of hired servants to their husbands. In what way does suffrage education or environment prepare the boy or girl for life or strengthen against temptation; it begins with an attack on all authority—parental or governmental. It goes on to inspire the girl with a cock-sure self-confidence which tempts her to make herself conspicious and to court dangers, doing reckless things which so far from proving her capacity to take care of herself proves just the contrary. To the boy it says: "Your sister is your physical, mental or moral equal. Let her look out for herself. Are you your sister's keeper?"

In a suffrage parade in Syracuse, N. Y., a banner was carried with the inscription, "There is a sweeter word than mother, home or heaven. That word is liberty." From the beginning of the woman movement, upon which the suffrage movement is a poisonous excrescence, there have been two distinct forces at work—the calm evolutionary growth of the sentiment as to the importance of woman as a factor in the social and civil development of the Christian State and the fanatical, destructive and unreasoning claims of those who would overturn the State and with it the Christian home and family. The evolutionary sentiment manifested itself in efforts for the improvement of educational facilities for women in order that they might be better prepared for their work as wives and mothers and might better train the coming generation in mind and morals.

On the other hand, women Suffragists, as they began to be called, urged the education of women along the same lines as men, demanding entrance into men's colleges, as well as political equality.

But a new sentiment was growing in America for years. The quiet home-loving woman had been watching to see what would be the result of this agitation of women, and they had formed

deep and decided convictions on the subject. In this demand for woman suffrage they saw an attempt to thrust upon them in addition to their own most important and exhausting duties the responsibilities hitherto borne by men.

The first stirrings of opposition were simultaneous, although unrelated in the East and the West, and started in 1880-1881, a period of renewed suffrage activity. It was shown by petitions and personal pleas, the circulation of literature and remonstrances in the public prints by prominent men and women. Even as early as 1873 a petition, signed by such well-known women as Catharine Beecher, Mrs. W. T. Sherman, Mrs. John A. Dahlgren, Mrs. Senator Edmunds, Mrs. Samuel T. Randall and many others from all over the country as far west as Oregon, was sent to Congress protesting against an extension of suffrage to women upon the same grounds as the protest of to-day.

Now year by year the opposition grew, until now in every State where the suffrage movement is active a counter movement is on foot, an active State organization is found. The States of Massachusetts and New York were organized in 1894, but Pennsylvania not until 1909. To quote the London *Spectator:* "We who are opposed to woman suffrage are in the position of those who defend a mighty fort—our homes—which has never been seriously threatened until now. So that the garrison is just wakening to the serious situation."

We believe that the majority of unprejudiced people only need to have the facts presented to them with the reasons why so large and influential a body oppose the ballot for women to awake to their own responsibility. While the position of the suffrage party now seems to be as expressed by one of their leaders, "Nothing counts but votes for women," no mere vote will satisfy the rebel woman. She will presently wish for the thick of the political battle.

Humanity is on the whole normal. It is impossible that any radical change in the position of women should be good. That is not in accordance with the needs of womankind in general. And what is not good for women is evil for men and for the State. It is our duty to place the welfare of the State before the desires of an exceptional group.

A certain number of women remain single and are, in a way, driven to do men's work, but the woman who is neither wife, mother nor homemaker is exceptional, abnormal. And we do not legislate merely in the interest of this minority. It is not of such units that a nation is made. The national unit is neither man or woman, but man and woman in that union, which finds expression in a home. Whatever tends to weaken this union is evil and must be fought as a public danger.

Men and women are only equal in the value of their differences, which makes each indispensable to the complete development of the other. It is quite as great a thing to be a woman as to be a man, although suffrage teachings seems to be to the contrary. The greatness lies in different powers. To a woman's powers the only limits are her folly, her insufficiency and her lack of faith in the eternal traditions of her sex. No outrage upon natural laws is tolerated in creation—the reaction is certain; but this fact does not allow the large majority of us to stand idle spectators of serious issues which threaten our most cherished ideals and possessions, as is done by the underlying current of the woman suffrage movement.

A Business Woman's Protest Against the Ballot

By Alice Edith Abell

The writer of this article is a woman employed by one of the largest corporations in the country as a stenographer. Having been with them for the past seven years, after a service in the Treasury Department at Washington for five years, in addition to short periods of employment with various firms. Her statements are from conviction based on experience and observation.

MUCH is said by the advocates of woman suffrage about the advantages of the ballot to the working woman, but these advantages are not specified. Until they can be not only specified but proven to overbalance the disadvantages of being placed on an equal political basis with the working man, it would be illogical and unhumanitarian to revise our law to that effect, for the working woman has a hard enough time at best.

Each added year's service in the business world emphasizes the fact that whatever wrongs exist there for the working woman, as in private life, are largely attributable to human nature, and human nature cannot be corrected or improved by ballot. It requires a more subtle instrument to adjust the personal equation, and that is the purpose of woman's situation and tact. In discarding these delicate and inimitable instruments for the blunter weapon she will be the inevitable loser, and will also forfeit the particular means of individual use with which she has been endowed by nature.

Whatever injustice there may be to a firm's employees is felt irrespective of sex, compatible with the demands of the work, except that, if there is any discrimination shown, it is almost invariably in favor of a woman. Many of her wrongs in a business house are fancied and are in reality a mistaken valuation of herself and her services, or lack of adaptability, which she can correct by self-education in the line of her work or a better understanding of and consideration for her fellow workers; for women in general have less natural business ambition and are more inclined to personal differences than men. This is because the business sphere is not natural to women as a sex, and it takes many of them a long time to adapt themselves to it, while some never succeed in doing so.

It is claimed that woman's presence in politics will improve the atmosphere as it has that of the business world. Whatever good effects on the opposite sex may have resulted from her entry into the field of commerce, in raising the moral tone and improving working conditions for her particular comfort, are more than offset by the consequent wear and tear on her nervous system, due to her need for a certain amount of relaxation which is not always compatible with the requirements of a successful business. While it is true that women have more endurance than men, and are often more than their equals in rising above actual physical limitations by means of this nerve force, there is no way of estimating at what point it may snap when continuously strained to its limit. The majority of women who, from financial necessity, have adopted a business career, especially one which does not permit of an annual vacation of at least one month in which to replenish this drain of nerve force, experience either a partial or a complete break-down sooner or later, from which it is difficult to recover without stepping out of the ranks at least temporarily—and it is not easy to step back at the same point. Even if that stage is not reached before exodus into the profession of the home, the results of the nerve strain are usually apparent in the next generation.

In advocating the equal franchise and economical independence of women, therefore, Suffragists present a very narrow and short-sighted view to the world. In the social scheme, as in business and politics, the individual profit must be subservient to the good of the whole, and because suffrage for women is desired by only a small minority, for their individual gain at the expense of the majority, its legal adoption would be monopolistic.

Protestantism and Suffrage

Read this statement of the Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix, late Rector of Trinity Church, New York. Contrast its firm tone with what a writer declares to be the attitude of many among the Protestant clergy.

"WHEN, therefore, the question is about the place and duties of the man or the woman in this world, the first point to settle is their relation to that visible organization called society, which they form, and with which their destinies are bound up. It is a practical question. Not in vague generalizations, not in the shadow-land of dreams, not in ecstatic visions of the excited imagination, must we seek the answer to our question. Come down to fact and reality. The place of man, the place of woman, their duties, mission, rights and powers, are to be determined simply by their relation in social life; they are members of well-defined organizations; of small organizations, first, of one larger organization, of which the small one is the unit. They live, move and have their being in society; and the last analysis of civilization is, not solitude, but a home.

"Now, if the man and the woman exist to multiply and replenish the earth, blessed to that end by the primal benediction in the morning of the world, and if they are to form homes, out of which shall grow houses, tribes, states and nations; and if, in designing them to that end, God made them essentially diverse the one from the other, establishing distinctions so obvious as to be immediately discerned, and so necessary that they have been maintained by many a law, human and divine, who can imagine that their work should be the same? The distinction, the difference, must run through the entire line of their activity. A man must have his share, a woman hers; the woman was not made to do the man's work, nor the man that of the woman's. To see this is wisdom; to maintain it inflexibly is security and peace; to ignore it must end in destruction and unhappiness."

—Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix.

ATTITUDE OF THE PROTESTANT CLERGY

By Veritas.

THE Protestant clergy in this country as a class is not opposing woman suffrage and in some instances appear to even favor the movement. In view of the fact that this must be considered clearly contrary to the teachings and ideals of Christianity, such conditions must impress one as strange, to say the least, yet the cause is not far to seek and will be readily understood through an interview I had with a clergyman friend some time ago. On my taking him to task for neglecting his plain duty in not opposing woman suffrage in the face of his oft-emphatically (privately, of course) expressed disapproval of the movement, he replied: "Of course, I fully realize my evident and serious short-coming, for there is no doubt in my mind that the 'craze,' for such I must call it, is directly opposed to the teachings and ideals of the Christian Church, and that whenever or wherever put in practice will eventually lead to its destruction, the end of our family relations and complete demoralization of our system of government. But what can I do in the way of opposition promising successful results? To be sure the great majority of my congregation of both sexes is clearly opposed, but unfortunately there are a few highly aggressive women supporters with a small following of weak and hysterical women and the leaders through their loud-mouthed, objectionable, and oftentimes unprincipled, tactics have practically terrorized the congregation, and I must confess its pastor also, thereby endeavoring to create the impression that the majority of the congregation was with them, which is surely not the case. You can realize that women of the class mentioned will not hesitate to make use of the worst means in order to carry their point or down opposition, and, therefore, by taking a stand against them I would make my position untenable and eventually cause the disruption of the church."

He furthermore expressed the opinion that like conditions existed in nearly all English-speaking Protestant churches in the United States and to a great extent in all other organizations with memberships composed exclusively or partly of women. On the ground that a bad excuse is better than none, some clergymen claim that woman suffrage is politics and that they believe in keeping politics out of the pulpit. Now, although nearly all great ethical questions are in a way connected with politics, should this stand in the way of the pulpit opposing with all means in its power a movement which through politics, if put that way, threatens the very existence of religion, the family and our system of government? The Catholic Church, as ever (when the family or morality is concerned), is fighting it without fear or favor and entirely regardless of their merely political interests, for in that direction it would for obvious reasons be greatly the gainer by its adoption.

It is, therefore, the obvious duty of all members and attendants of Protestant churches who have the highest interests of the church and humanity at heart to awaken the consciences of their pastors if derelict in their duties, and when successful by giving them their loyal and enthusiastic support, help to clear the Protestant clergy of this very serious charge now resting against it.

SUFFRAGETTE PARODY OF THE LITANY

SUFFRAGETTES made an organized interruption of the service at St. Paul's Cathedral on a recent Sunday morning.

The Rev. Arthur Streeten was reciting the Litany and had just pronounced the words, "and to shew Thy pity upon all prisoners and captives," when a body of Suffragettes, about twenty in number, who were seated almost immediately below the pulpit, rose and sang to a setting which harmonized with the chanting of the choristers a specially composed verse as follows:

Save Emmeline Pankhurst!
Spare her! Spare her!
Give her light and set her free!
Save her! Save her!
Hear us while we pray to Thee!

The congregation remained calm and the vergers approaching the women urged them to withdraw. They protested, but made no effort at resistance and filed quietly out.

"If a Glasgow lad wearies of work he marries a Dundee lassie," runs the saying in Scotland. Dundee, the center of the jute trade, must surely be an industrial paradise from the Suffragists' point of view. Women form three-fifths of the persons employed; they, rather than the men, carry on the skilled processes of the trade, and the employment of married women takes place on a large scale. Here are women who cannot be taunted with the adjective "parasites," and yet what do we find as the result of their labors? The highest infant mortality rate in Scotland; physical deterioration of so grave a character that the Chief Inspector of Factories in his report for 1900 spoke on a height of five feet and a weight of nine stone as being of common occurrence in men of twenty years and upwards; and general social and domestic conditions which are the despair of all who know them.—Violet Markham.

California's Social and Political Evolution Under Suffrage

By Alice Hill Chittenden

Miss Chittenden, President of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, spent several months recently in California studying the social and political changes due to the enfranchisement of women. Her article is therefore authoritative.

I WOULD challenge the statement of anyone that woman suffrage was either a complete failure or complete success in the State of California. I consider eighteen months too short a time in which to gauge the effect of woman's entry into affairs political—either upon the State or upon the woman herself.

I saw, however, many evidences in California to support the two contentions made by the Anti-Suffragists; first, that woman suffrage will only increase the indifferent electorate; and secondly, that the conscientious women who do vote will soon discover that suffrage is much more than putting a piece of paper into a box once a year, since they will find themselves drawn into political organizations. The woman with political aspirations is also already a factor to be reckoned with in that State.

First, as to woman's indifference to the suffrage. While I was in Pasadena a Bond election was held on five separate propositions. Four of them had to do with securing land to be used as playgrounds in public parks. The papers were full of letters urging the necessity of securing this land for playgrounds, as the city was rapidly growing and the price of land would, in consequence, soon be prohibitive. The result of the election was disappointing. All the propositions were defeated, while, according to the City Clerk of Pasadena, only one-fourth of the registered voters, both men and women, voted. Yet four of these propositions had to do with questions involving bettering the conditions of children by providing playgrounds; and we are told women would be especially interested in securing such benefits if they had a vote.

A short time after there was a similar election in Berkeley. After the election the Mayor of the City, who is a Suffragist, said in an interview: "There is mob violence in some countries and strident oratory elsewhere on behalf of votes for women. Here in California we have woman suffrage, and Berkeley is one of the star centers of that movement. Surely adequate playground facilities for 7,000 children is a subject for woman's thought and vote, and yet out of 8,000 women voters only about 1,500 of them cared enough to vote on this important subject. Where were the mothers?"

I followed three elections in Los Angeles very closely. At the first one held in March eighteen charter amendments were submitted to the voters. One of them provided for a primary election in May in order to elect an entire, new municipal ticket a month later in June. Mayor Alexander, who was elected just after the MacNamara excitement, had only served eighteen months of his term of office, but several factions in the city were against him, so this amendment to the charter was proposed in order to get rid of him.

Another amendment was Socialism pure and simple, since it permitted the city of Los Angeles "to acquire, own, sell, deal in, manage, operate or control any office, department, business enterprise, 'utility or proprietary' which might or could be acquired, owned, held, sold, dealt in, managed, operated or controlled by any present firm or corporation whatever."

This amendment, as well as the one calling for the primary election, was adopted, but out of approximately 165,000 registered voters, only about 31,000 went to the polls. The Los Angeles *Times* said: "The vote of the women was a disappointment. In some places it was a negligible quantity; in others about one-third of the total vote."

At the primary election in May 78,000 voted and at the final election in June about 90,000. The *Examiner* said the vote was surprisingly small for a municipal election. The same paper remarked: "Few women voted in the districts where working people live—in one district, out of 154 votes cast, only five were women, and in another labor district out of 212 votes it was calculated that only thirty were cast by women. This raises the query: Does the working woman want the ballot as much as the Suffragists would have us believe she does?"

These figures bear out the contention that woman suffrage increases the indifferent vote; first, through their own indifference, and secondly, because a shared responsibility is not the same as full responsibility, and men feel less responsibility in political affairs than they did before women voted; as one man said, to put it briefly, "The stock is watered."

In the six suffrage States—California, Colorado, Wyoming, Washington, Idaho and Utah—at the last Presidential election only 47½ per cent. of a possible total vote, according to population over 21 years old, voted; while in the six States where only men vote—Kansas, Nebraska, Oregon, Nevada, South Dakota and Missouri—at the same election 69 per cent. voted. So much for indifference—how about the activity?

There are many thoughtless women who are beguiled to enroll under the banner of "Votes for Women" because they are told it is dropping a piece of paper in a box once a year, and that women can run out and vote while the bread is baking or the baby taking a nap. Now while suffrage does not entail office holding for all women any more than it does for all men, there are bound to be some women office seekers, and they will naturally turn to their sex for support. This will necessitate organization. There will be district leaders to get out the woman's vote, just as district leaders now get out the men's vote. The Los Angeles *Times* said after the June election: "In spite of the excellent organization of Mrs. John Myers and her assistants, the women did not turn out in any large numbers." The only Justice of the Peace in California who was appointed to office about a year ago recently resigned because the women did not give her organized support. "'If they had," she said, "it might have been different," and then added that she found the duties of office too great a nerve strain. "I doubt," she said, "whether women could stand the strain."

The women of Colorado recently appealed to President Wilson for from one-third to one-half of the Federal patronage of Colorado. Patronage has proved a stumbling-block to more than one sincere conscientious man who has gone into office to clean up politics, and now the women of Colorado are planning for their share in this dubious business of distributing patronage. The woman Justice of the Peace in California and the women of Colorado clamoring for patronage are instances which show that in States where woman suffrage prevails, women have found out that voting is more than going to the polls once a year.

The women's clubs in California have largely abandoned their programmes of culture and study and have become political organizations. The women lobbyists of Sacramento were in evidence throughout the legislative session. The women of San Francisco take full credit for the recent recall of a judge who let off a man on small bail who had committed felonious assault. One Suffragist indignantly denied that the men had played any part in this proceeding and said in an interview: "Who instituted the recall campaign; who stood for days in the street in all sorts of weather asking for signatures for the recall petition and made the house-to-house canvass to arrange the recall campaign, and raised the money?" One is tempted to add "Who looked after the women's homes and children while they were doing all this?" The judge was recalled by 815 votes and the election cost the city $45,000. The man who succeeded him in office has been guilty of letting a man who abandoned wife and children go on still smaller bail than his predecessor. Will there be another recall?

Much has been said about the "progressive" legislation during

this recent session. We read of the long list of remedial laws having been placed on the statute books, and learn that the women who helped to elect the Legislature of 1913 take full credit for all such laws. But legislation of this kind costs money, and the taxpayers of California will soon discover what it has cost them. The appropriation for governing that State, with a population of 2,377,549 (Census, 1910), amounts to nearly $20,000,000, which is $3,000,000 in excess of the appropriations two years ago.

The Legislature created thirty-one commissions. It would seem as if a commission had been created to investigate every known subject. The Industrial Accident Commission carried an appropriation of $312,000; the Emigration and Housing Commission carried an appropriation of $50,000, the State Board of Chirpody $25,000, the State Board of Apiary Examiners an appropriation of $10,000; $20,000 was appropriated for a commission to investigate as well as to fix a minimum wage. Several bills for Mothers' Pensions were introduced, and the one finally passed is not satisfactory. The storm of protest against some of these Commissions finally reached the Governor's ears and he did not sign all the bills. The eight-hour law for women was passed before women voted in California, through the influence of the labor unions. It has had the desired effect of driving women out of some of the positions they had hitherto held. This session an attempt was made to extend the law to graduate trained nurses, but such a protest was made by the nurses themselves that it was finally extended to only student nurses.

The State seems to have gone mad over the idea that everything under the sun can be regulated by law. Some 4,000 bills were introduced into the session, and of these about 1,100 were passed. Many can be classified as freak legislation. One bill sought to regulate the size of chicken coops and another to dictate the style of shoes school children should wear.

Much has been made by the Suffragists of the Red Light Abatement Law, and the women take full credit for this. But a similar law exists in Iowa and Nebraska where women do not vote. There is such a division of opinion on the question of this law that the machinery for securing a referendum on it has already been set in motion. The remedial legislation enacted in the different States during 1913 has not as yet been fully classified, but New York has twenty-three labor laws to her credit, and both New York and Massachusetts passed a "One day rest in seven bill," which failed to pass in California (National Association for Labor Legislation).

Before going to California a Suffragist asked me to investigate the question of license and find out since when the number of dry towns in California had increased from 200 to 600. I took pains to investigate this and found that six months *before* women voted the Wylie Liquor Option Law was passed. This law makes it possible for any incorporated city or town to hold a special election on the question of licensing the sale of liquor upon application of 25 per cent. of the registered voters. There was scarcely a day passed that the vote of some town on this question was not recorded in the papers, and they did not all go dry. In the first two weeks in May I kept track of these elections and found that seven towns voted wet, while one voted dry. That town was Santa Barbara, where the adoption of a high license threw many small saloons out of business, although liquor can still be obtained in hotels in that place.

A study of the whole license question reveals the fact all over the country that since 1907 the no-license area in the United States has increased, until in 1913 over 50 per cent. of the population and about 72 per cent. of the area is under no-license. Women do not vote in the nine Prohibition States—Georgia, Kansas (these figures are before women voted in Kansas), Maine, Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma and Tennessee and West Virginia, and they only vote in two of the seventeen States in which 50 per cent. or more of the population is under no-license. Women do not vote in the five States which consume the most liquor—Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin—neither do they vote in the five States which consume the least liquor—Alabama, Georgia, Maine, North Dakota and Tennessee. These figures certainly show that there is no connection between woman suffrage and the general condition of license or prohibition throughout the country.

All Anti-Suffragists believe in much of the remedial legislation which is being enacted every year in various States, but we do not believe that any State can stand the expense of such legislation when enacted in wholesale quantities. California is in the throes of experimental radicalism at the present time, and the women of that State, far from being a steadying force, have fanned the fire into flame.

Problem Women Alone Can Solve—Without the Vote

By Reina A. Lawrence

RETURNING from the convention of the International Association of the Chiefs of Police held in Washington, D. C., early in June, Chief Kiely of Plainfield reported that "the consensus of opinion of 600 chiefs present was that the social evil is a sex problem that women alone can solve."

Very satisfactory to our suffrage friends thus far, but—O those horrible buts!—the chief continues:

"The women themselves can abolish the social evil, *not by means of the ballot*, but by spreading the broad mantle of Christian charity about their sisters who have fallen.

"The women will turn their backs on a poor girl who has been unfortunate, probably because of her environment.

"The fact is, however, that the women instead of trying to reclaim the fallen one, exclude her from their society. If the women would throw a protecting arm around these unfortunate girls, try to give them another chance in life, the social evil would soon be a part of the history of our unhappy past."

Here is the opinion of those men from many parts of the world, some from suffrage States and countries, who are surely qualified to *know*.

As Chief Kiely says in conclusion: "The police throughout the world have for years struggled with this appalling thing, and their opinions must have weight with thinking people."

One girl's case which came within my personal knowledge goes to prove the correctness of their theory.

When she was but eighteen years old, and her child was nearly two, the physician in her home town got her a position in the sewing room of a New York hospital.

The girls with whom she worked became aware of her story and that she was supporting her boy in a New York institution, paying for his board $2 of her $4 per week.

She lived at this hospital.

A course of persecution was begun by the girls, aided by two ardent Suffragists among the nurses, with the design of forcing the poor child from an honest living.

The girls being very youthful, felt themselves defiled by working in the same room.

The Suffragist nurses, women of mature age, wished to force her out, *"because she would be so strong an example of the vileness of a man who could ruin so young and innocent a girl."* Reminded of the only life open to her, if driven from that one, they shrugged their shoulders and said: "Good enough for her." And they were always preaching the vileness of the man! I was a constant visiting patient at the hospital and saw much that was going on and the girl's evident shame and distress. I investigated her story—a peculiarly sad one—and laid it in all its awfulness and pathos before the five head physicians. They stood by her to a man. She remained in that position for fifteen years, ten of which she was head of the sewing-room, supporting her boy in an institution. Now they have a home in the country, and the son of twenty is manly and tender, and grateful to the mother who has given him a chance to be a self-respecting man. Two lives saved through just what the chiefs of police urge, a woman's interest and what we would always find if we sought the good men ready to help a girl to live down and overcome the sin of a bad one. But the Suffragist nurses lost a "horrible example" to aid them to plead for that which each one desired for her individual gratification—A Vote.

Suffage and Socialism—Two Letters

WELLESLEY, MASS., May 21, 1913.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WOMAN'S PROTEST:

On receiving to-day a copy of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST I turned first to the letter on Suffragism and Socialism. Will you permit me, a Suffragist and Socialist, to disclaim some of the views attributed to those of my opinion?

First, whatever some Socialists may believe, it seems to me very loose to say that Suffragists in general are really Socialists. Practically all Socialists are equal Suffragists; but equal Suffragists are by no means all Socialists. Some are Anti-Socialists. Equal suffrage is a political question; Socialism involves both political and economic conditions. The Suffragist believes that true political democracy involves making the qualifications for the ballot the same for both sexes. The Socialist believes this, and also believes that economic democracy implies a different industrial organization from the present.

Second, though there are doubtless among the Socialists wild spirits who "desire to do away with marriage . . . and to have in its place a mutual understanding that can result in quick, easy divorce at the will of either party without the red tape and mud-slinging of to-day," the rank and file of the movement are plain, hard-working people who desire better economic conditions, not to alter the marriage relation, but to provide more comfortable homes and better education for their families. Socialism does not mean "the doing away with marriage and the home as we know them to-day," if that means loosening the marriage bond. It does aim at the restoring to home life of many women and children now forced to labor outside the home—except where women may choose voluntarily to work outside.

Third, the statement that Socialism means "the abolition of private productive property" might mislead a careless reader. Socialism does not mean the abolition of all private property. It means enlarging and securing the private property of the workers; but contemplates public ownership of such great industries as vitally concern the public welfare. It would, as "9 B" says, inaugurate the co-operative commonwealth. A society co-operating toward great social ends and forgetting the economic war of man against man, unwilling that any should perish—is this an ideal to be ashamed of?

Fourth, let me hasten to add that I do not expect either equal suffrage or Socialism to bring in a Utopia. I believe in both because they seem to me more just than present arrangements. And justice is usually the final touch-stone of social institutions. But perfect justice we cannot hope to see on earth.

Fifth, can we not on both sides cease to disparage each other's motives and to accuse each other of disingenuous conduct?

Finally, another article leads me to say that I believe most American Suffragists disapprove whole heartedly the methods of the English "militants," even though a few individuals may endorse them. The failure of a convention to condemn does not, I think, mean approval, but doubt as to the best course of action. The great majority of Suffragists abhor militant tactics.

Yours very truly,
(MISS) JOSEPHINE BURNHAM.

AUGUST 4, 1913.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WOMAN'S PROTEST:

A copy of Miss Josephine Burnham's letter in reply to my letter published in the May number of THE PROTEST having been sent me, I will make the following answer. In the very beginning I want to state that Miss Burnham is evidently not a Socialist.

Miss Burnham makes three assertions: First, she says that "equal Suffragists are by no means all Socialists." I did not say that all Suffragists were Socialists. I do say, however, that they are working for something which the Socialists are also striving most energetically to obtain, and which any intelligent observer, whether Socialist or non-Socialist, can readily see would result in Socialism. The abler and more intelligent women in the Woman Suffrage Party have long realized this. Such leaders as Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissewein, Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell and Miss Jessie Ashley are avowed Socialists and call themselves Socialists.

Daniel DeLeon, who is perhaps the most prominent Socialist in the United States, says:

"It is an optical illusion to suppose that woman suffrage can to-day be obtained separately from the Socialist Republic," and that: "If woman suffrage in capitalist countries is anything it is a breath of the Social Revolution."

Barnet Braverman, the well-known Socialist writer, says: "No two social movements ever had so much in common as Socialism and woman suffrage."

It is only the rank and file of the woman suffrage party who are unaware of this very evident fact and are being led blindly by the nose in aid of Socialism by their clever Socialist leaders. These leaders do not hesitate to keep their followers in the dark as to the real significance of woman suffrage, because they know that most of them would revolt at the tenets of Socialism. The average Suffragist is in entire ignorance of what she is really working for.

In her second assertion Miss Burnham states that it is only "wild spirits among the Socialists who 'desire to do away with marriage and to have in its place a mutual understanding that can be broken by quick, easy divorce at the will of either party,' and that Socialism does not mean 'the doing away with marriage and the home as we know them to-day,' if that means loosening the marriage bond."

If Miss Burnham is sincere in this statement, as I said in the beginning, she is evidently not a Socialist, or else she has been sadly misled into calling herself one. I can only refer her for her own enlightenment to the following well-known Socialists who advocate free love and ask her how she regards their position in the party to which she professes allegiance:

Karl Marx, who is often called the Father of Socialism, in "The Communist Manifesto," says: "The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital."

Robert Owen, the great English Socialist, declared that "The three great obstacles to social reform are private property, religion and the present form of marriage."

Mrs. Meta L. Stern, who is Secretary of the Socialist Woman's Committee of Local New York, states that: "The present marriage ceremony will be abolished, together with all other useless and ridiculous ceremonies, when Socialism is established," and that "a mutual understanding that can be broken by quick, easy divorce at the will of either party will be substituted in its place."

Miss Jessie Ashley, who is a prominent contributor to *The Progressive Woman*, a Socialist paper published in Chicago, as well as being treasurer last year of the National Woman Suffrage Association, puts wives and prostitutes in the same category. She says: "Slaves, every woman of them to-day, whether prostitutes held unwillingly or prostitutes gone willingly 'astray,' whether submissive wife or rebellious virgin."

Mrs. Rosalind G. Winslow, whose husband Horatio G. Winslow, is editor of *The Masses*, a New York Socialist paper, and who is herself a prominent member of the Socialist party, declares: "Marriage, in my view, is an absolute mistake. It does not hold any person. We simply go through the ceremony to appease society." And further on in the same article she describes marriage as "mummery."

In her third assertion Miss Burnham declares that "Socialism does not mean the abolition of all private property." I never said that it did. I was very careful to say private productive property, but again she has been misled if she thinks that it means only, to quote her, the "public ownership of such great industries as vitally concern the public welfare."

Socialism means very much more than that. It means that the State will own everything that can produce revenue except Man himself. All Socialist writers are very explicit on this point. However, I will quote only Marx to illustrate. He says: "In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend."

The other points which Miss Burnham brings up in her letter are in reference to other articles than mine. In conclusion, let me call the attention of Suffragists and Suffragettes to this sentence of Marx and ask them if this is what they want: "They (the Socialists) openly declare that their ends can be obtained only by the forcible overthrow of *all existing social conditions.*" If the Suffragists favor the abolition of marriage and the doing away with private property, then let them openly declare themselves to be Socialists as their leaders, Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissewein, Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell and Miss Jessie Ashley, have done. But if they do not believe in these radical, revolutionary measures, then let them stop for a moment and realize that every Socialist is a woman Suffragist, and that the Socialists are working night and day to bring woman suffrage about. Let them read what leading Socialists like Daniel DeLeon and Barnet Braverman are saying. Then, I am sure, they will not any longer allow themselves to be led along like geese by the clever Socialists who are running the Woman Suffrage Movement. On the contrary, they will appreciate their danger and work with all their might and main against it. (Signed) G. B.

Suffrage and the Family

By Mrs. Charles P. Strong

In a letter recently printed in the Boston *Globe* a Suffragist says: "The recent claims of the Anti that suffrage is a direct attack against the family seem too senseless to emanate from sane people." She will probably change her mind when she proceeds to read the writings of such representative Suffragists as Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Miss Inez Milholland and examines the very latest official publication of the Suffragists, "The Case for Woman Suffrage," with an introduction by Miss M. Cary Thomas. She will then realize why such distinguished writers as Miss Ida Tarbell and Mr. E. S. Martin—who are surely to be regarded as sane—declare that Suffragists are attacking the family.

They attack both its economic and its moral basis. In the present order of society husband and wife are economically interdependent; she depends upon him for their support, he upon her for the care of their home and children. Suffragists would put an end to this division of labor. "Sex equality," we are told, "is antagonistic to wife maintenance." "The highest sphere for woman," says Mrs. Belmont, "is not the home, but independence, and the girl who is earning a good salary is unwise if she gives up her position to marry any man." Miss Thomas, in her Mt. Holyoke address last fall, protested earnestly against the idea that a woman teacher should abandon her profession merely because she gets married. "The woman," Mrs. Gilman asserts, "should have as much to do in the home as the man—no more."

As for the care of children, one of the most lauded suffrage books, Olive Schreiner's "Woman and Labor," an argument for women going out into the world to work, offers no explanation on the rather important question, what is to become of them when the mother is thus engaged? The works of Mrs. Gilman frankly deny that the home is the best institution for rearing children. "If the child is not seriously ill," she tells us, "the nurse is as good as the mother; and if the child is seriously ill the nurse is better." Mrs. Stanton Blatch, who in her lecture, "The Economic Emancipation of Woman," rejoiced in the establishment of co-operative working-woman's dwellings because it was a blow aimed at the isolated home, advocated the institutional care of children. The only logical corollary of the Suffragist doctrine of the economic independence of the mother is, indeed, the committing of children to State institutions.

The moral basis of the family is the sentiment that marriage is a mutually binding promise of permanent union, to be dissolved only by death or for grievous wrongdoing. Faith in the permanency of love is its very foundation. But this, Miss Milholland informs us, is a pitiable delusion. "Love," she says, "is no such definite and settled quality as our dogma and laws vainly insist that it must and shall be." Once economically independent, woman will be free to separate from her husband whenever she desires to; and Miss Milholland perceives with pleasure "the beginnings of a breakdown of the artificial barriers in the way of a more natural observance of the mating instinct"—or, in plain words, the beginnings of free love.

It is here unnecessary to point out the falsity of the economics and the viciousness of the ethics upon which these doctrines rest. It must, however, be clear that they make for the destruction of the family and that the consistent and leading Suffragists are advocating them.

Women's Vote *Is* Decreasing

Although it is not the policy of the Anti-Suffragists to enter into controversy over the inaccurate statements of Suffragist spellbinders, a recent letter to the Elizabeth, N. J., *Journal* by Alice Stone Blackwell furnishes an admirable opportunity to prove our contention that women do not generally use the ballot when it is given them, and to show the kind of juggling which some Suffragists give to statistics.

In answer to the statement of the Anti-Suffragists that the school vote in Massachusetts has steadily fallen off, Miss Blackwell says: "In the twenty years from 1890 to 1910 the women's school vote averaged 15,600; in 1911 it rose to 22,755 and in 1912 it more than doubled, reaching the *high-water mark* of 48,127 (the italics are mine). Miss Blackwell's attention is called to the fact that she makes no mention of the increase in population during these years. The average yearly increase in the number of women of voting age during the twenty years mentioned is 17,544, or 2,000 more than the average vote as given by Miss Blackwell, so that the ratio of women voting to the number entitled to vote has decreased astonishingly.

In 1911 when the woman's school vote, according to Miss Blackwell reached 22,755, special issues in elections in Fall River and Lowell brought out an unprecedented vote of both men and women in those towns, and of the entire increase of 7,155 women's votes in Massachusetts over the average of the preceding years 7,074, or 98 per cent., were given in these two towns alone, only 2 per cent. of the increase coming from the rest of the State.

In 1912 four cities had similar special issues and 76 per cent. of the increase was found in these four towns. This increase was due to sectarian contests, and was in no sense typical. Even then the high-water mark, as Miss Blackwell calls it, of 48,127 shows that less than 4 per cent. of the women of the State availed themselves of the opportunity to vote even when aroused by religious controversy.

Boston, which might be a fairly accurate representation of facts, shows the following steady decrease in the school vote for the past four years:

Women of voting age in 1910—217,888

	1910	1911	1912	1913
Number voting....	5,530	6,350	4,939	4,887

The number of women of voting age in Boston has increased more than 30 per cent. between 1895 and 1913, and the actual vote has decreased 46 per cent. in the same period. The number of women voting in 1895 was 9,049, in 1913, 4,887. Dr. Edward M. Hasting (?), Statistician for the City of Boston, says: "This year's vote is the smallest, but one of its class since 1887—the vote in 1908 being 4,363.

—Minnie Bronson.

Many Suffragists now assert the right to sin and "pass on." Do they grant the same privilege to their masculine equals?

CATHOLIC OPPOSITION TO SUFFRAGE

Under the heading, "Catholic Women Unite to Oppose Suffrage," the Milwaukee *Sentinel* of August 5th says:

According to an announcement received from Buffalo on Monday, the German Roman Catholic Central Verein has organized a Catholic Women's League to counteract the present feminist movement.

Much interest has been aroused in Milwaukee by the announcement, as the Catholic Federation, which meets here next week, beginning on Sunday, will also form an organization of Catholic women to combat the tendency of the Suffragist movement.

While it is not the intention of the organizations to engage actively in a campaign against woman suffrage, it is aimed to counteract the evil effect which is seen as a result of the gaining of votes by women in many parts of the country.

The German Verein at Buffalo has announced that branches of the new woman's organization will be established in all parts of the country.

"The feminist movement is being promoted by women whose ideas are decidedly pagan," said Mrs. Joseph Frey, Buffalo, honorary president of the new society.

"The idea of our organization is to counteract the effect, which is rapidly spreading, of this move toward votes for women. Already several States have given woman the ballot, and it is high time that opponents of the idea are becoming more active. A body of conservative women, openly proclaiming themselves opposed to equal suffrage, can do much to check this nation-wide tendency.

"While the Catholic church has made no pronouncement on the matter of woman suffrage, the Catholic philosophy of life is opposed to it. However, we are not centering our activities in opposition to woman suffrage, but rather in a plan for the future."

AN AGGRAVATION OF SOCIAL ILLS

An Editorial From the "Louisville Courier-Journal," August 4, 1913.

The wife of the Vice-President—a woman of sense and virtue not carried away by the hysteria of the times—thinks that the bizarre in the conduct and dress of certain women indicates their unfitness to vote.

We should not generalize this observation. It applies solely and directly to the women implicated. A woman who will indecorously expose herself is fit for nothing. If we compare the unfit men with the unfit women we shall find that the men in unfitness have much the better of it. We are having quite an upheaval about the "split skirt." After the tango, why not? Nevertheless, bless God, there's a right smart chance o' women left who do not care for either.

Inevitably, Mrs. Marshall, the wife of the Vice-President, like Mrs. Scott, the president-general of the Daughters of the American Revolution—being normal women as well as learned in worldly wisdom and experience—oppose the mad rush of those of their less sagacious and self-controlled sisters after "votes for women." They know the suffrage is a cure for no social or moral evil—rather an aggravation—for whatever gets into politics is likely to be polluted. We are living in a period of transition, an epoch of investigation, an age of unrest. It is all over the world. It means, to quote and commend the words of Edward Sanford Martin, a general reaching out for more, for more liberty, more justice, more opportunity, more to eat, more money to spend, more fun, more leisure, more knowledge. In the masses of the people there is a longing for a better chance and a fuller life. That is a phenomenon, and, of course, women have their share of it.

The people moved by this general unrest, Mr. Martin tells us, don't know precisely what they want nor how to get it. They don't know at all accurately what is right and what is wrong in the way the world is run at present, nor what resources are available to satisfy their yearnings, nor what instrumentalities of government and justice are defective or obsolete, nor who, nor what, is to blame for distresses or wants or restrictions that they chafe under. Every innovator, every mover for new methods, every vaunter of a new remedy, finds his opportunity in this prevailing temper. That is why Teddy has such a large personal following.

Listen to Debs, lately the Socialist candidate for President, in his speech accepting the nomination:

"Capitalism is rushing blindly to its impending doom. All the signs portend the inevitable breakdown of the existing order. Deep-seated discontent has seized upon the masses. Poverty, high prices, unemployment, child slavery, widespread misery and haggard want in a land bursting with abundance; prostitution and insanity, suicide and crime; these in solemn numbers tell the tragic story of capitalism's saturnalia of blood and tears and shame as its end draws near."

When that sort of discourse engages the sympathies of millions of men there is bound to be unrest among women. There is unrest among women because there is unrest in the air they breathe, and, naturally, it takes its own special forms. The form that is most conspicuous is the aspiration for suffrage.

A portion of women—how large no one yet knows—have reached the conclusion that they want to vote. That seems to stand in their minds as the evidence of equality with man. Give them the ballot and they will see to it that women are paid the same wages as men for the same work, that the factory laws are what they should be, that white slavery is abolished, that child labor is duly guarded and restricted, and "the like o' that an' sich." Not only are the Suffragists restless themselves, but they force disturbance on apparently a large majority of women who have found their vocation in life, and are fairly satisfied with it, or else see no cure in suffrage for what they don't like, and fear its drawbacks more than they anticipate its benefits.

Such women, Mrs. Marshall and Mrs. Scott for example, find themselves threatened with political obligations which they think do not belong to them, and which they do not wish to incur, unless they organize their opposition and make it felt. And this some of them are doing, and with energy, though not with much joy in the combat. For, much as they dislike the duty, it is not one that can safely be neglected by women who believe that political government will remain in the hands of men anyhow, and that it is better that the responsibility should go with the power.

Wise women still prefer that it should so remain. Wise women prefer, other things being equal, government by men to government by women. And that seems a sound preference, for though it might seem natural that women should side with women against men, and men with men against women, that is not so natural as it seems, and usually does not happen. It is woman, not man, that is indispensable to man, and he is notoriously prone to take the side of a woman against a man; and it is man, not woman, that is indispensable to woman, and at a pinch she will usually cleave to her own as against her like.

The *Courier-Journal* thinks that women are as fit to vote as men—or would be when educated and prepared for it as men are—but it has higher aims and uses for women and does not wish to degrade them to the level of man and the ballot.

The superintendence of a household, even when in other respects not laborious, is extremely onerous to the thoughts; it requires incessant vigilance, an eye from which no detail escapes, and presents questions for consideration and solution, foreseen and unforeseen, at every hour of the day, from which the person responsible for them can hardly ever shake herself free.—John Stuart Mill on "Subjection of Women."

NOTES AND COMMENT

Goldsmith, Revised by the Militant Suffragettes

When lovely Sylvia gets the ballot
And finds too late that votes betray,
For what, then, will she wield the mallet
And dynamite, Election Day?

How hopelessly old-fashioned is the doctor who expects his wife to be a housewife, mother, helpmate and not too extravagant. Yet such women, more than the men, have made America!—*N. Y. Evening Mail.*

MRS. VOTELEIGH (coming home at eleven): "Are the dear children all right? I haven't set eyes on them since morning."

HER HUSBAND: "Huh! You go about airing your views; better you'd stay at home and view your heirs."—*Boston Transcript.*

The fierce struggle of women to wrest the labor field from men, to undersell their own husbands, fathers and brothers is a monstrous perversion alike of industrial, domestic and moral order. A society which continues to develop on this line is lost.—Frederic Harrison.

The obvious conclusion of all suffrage arguments is that only Suffragists can cast an enlightened and intelligent vote. They are constantly calling our attention to the ignorance, venality and prejudice of all other women. What a pity then that Suffragists are a minority of women!

The latest report of the Federal Children's Bureau at Washington states that "150,000 babies needlessly die each year in the United States, due to mothers' lack of knowledge." Would votes for women supply this need?

The *London Daily Mail* of July 7, contains the following article. Is this an indication of woman's progress?:

"Two women played the part of violent housebreakers in France. They entered the house of a working man while he was away, and seized, gagged and bound his wife. They then robbed her of £4 which she had been saving to pay the rent and had hidden among the linen in her linen cupboard."

She is only an old Irish woman, but she voiced in simple language what has much truth and more in it than she would know. "'Suff'rin' for wimmin' is it? Well, I should just think them crazy wimmin must all be ould enough to know that wimmin has enough of suff'rin' at all times without trying to force any more on 'em. Sure, why can't they be contint to let the men have the suff'rin' of politics and votin'? 'Tis good enough for 'em, sez I."

The San Francisco (Cal.) *Chronicle* says: "Chicago fears that woman suffrage may vote her 'dry.' A survey of States and countries having equal suffrage shows that far more are 'wet' than 'dry.' Indeed, the difficulty encountered by both Suffragettes and Antis is that of showing any distinctive changes, either for better or worse, resulting from universal suffrage. It is with women as with men, the vote means far more before than after they get it—which is true of most reforms."

Dr. Hardy, in the historical section of the *London Congress of Medicine,* August 12th, made a stinging criticism of Suffragette militancy, which he characterized as an epidemic of mental disorder akin to the dancing mania of the fourteenth century. The president of the section, to whom a copy of the paper had previously been submitted, ruled that part of it was out of order and requested Dr. Hardy not to read it on the ground that it dealt with matters of actual politics, adding, however, the words, "I daresay many of us agree with you."

Walter Sichel, the author of "Disraeli," "Sheridan," "Lady Hamilton" and other works of history and biography, in an article of recent date on "Social Anarchy," comments severely on the decadence of taste, manners and habits of the present day. He calls the modern woman a "rebel" and at the same time a "slave"—to her own "sloppiness"—and makes the pregnant remark, "And men might at least set the example to women if women will not raise the standard for men." It is to be hoped they will do so, for living down to the feminist standard is demoralizing the whole race at present.

If the wife undertakes the careful and economical application of the husband's earnings to the general comfort of the family, she takes not only her fair share but usually the larger share of the bodily and mental exertion required by their joint existence. If she undertakes any additional position it seldom relieves her from this, but only prevents her from performing it properly. The care which she herself is prevented from taking of the children nobody else takes; those of the children who do not die grow up as best they can.—John Stuart Mill on "The Subjection of Women."

It is obvious that no partnership nor cooperative society could long exist where the partners or members were rivals instead of allies—even in a game of bridge partners do not neglect each other's interest and each other's signal, or if they do they lose the game. Suffragists may foresee a society and marriage customs in which such conditions prevail, but they would never last long and would eventually be dealt with like mutiny on board a ship: by firm discipline, and the strongest would triumph. In any real appeal to force man is stronger than woman, in any actual industrial competition man can endure longer than women. The object for which he endures is removed, however, when woman becomes his rival and not his helpmate and ally—and in that case it is more than likely that he may prefer the less arduous position himself, handing over the earning to his mate in her role of equal, or taking to himself the economic independence of the free male.

VOTE VOTE VOTE

(With apologies to the master poet who wrote "Break, Break, Break.")

Vote, vote, vote
On election day, oh she!
And I would that my tongue could utter
The thoughts that arise in me!

Oh, sad for the new woman's boy
When mother is out 'lectioneering
Oh, sad for the wee baby girl
When the ship of state she's steering!

The battle for ballots is on
Fair fighters enlist with a will
But oh it is fine when women take time
Their womanly mission to fill!

Vote, vote, vote
On election day oh she!
But the tender grace of a day that's dead
Will never come back to thee.

Vote, vote, vote
If you really think that you must
But the price you will pay, will be heavy some day
And 'twill bow your soul to the dust!

JEANNETTE CADWALLADER.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set 50 cts. Single copies 5 cts.

PAMPHLETS

Woman and the Law — By *Francis M. Scott*
Address Before Constitutional Convention, 1894 — By *Hon. Elihu Root*
First Address Before the New York Legislature, 1895 — By *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Problem of Woman Suffrage — By *Adeline Knapp*
Woman's Rights in America — By *Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question — By *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Wages and the Ballot — By *Mary Dean Adams*
Should We Ask for the Suffrage? — By *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*
How Women Can Best Serve the State — By *Mrs. Barclay Hazard*
The Blank Cartridge Ballot — By *Rossiter Johnson*
Taxation and Suffrage — By *Frederick Dwight*
Real Opponents to the Suffrage Movement — By *Edward W. Bok*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government — By *Prof. Edward D. Cope*
Do Working Women Need the Ballot? — By *Adeline Knapp*
Woman's Progress Versus Woman Suffrage — By *Helen Kendrick Johnson*
What Women Have Actually Done Where They Vote — By *Richard Barry*
Woman's Relation to Government — By *Mrs. William Forse Scott*
The Legal Status of Women — By *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
Feminism — By *Prof. Dr. Melchinor Palagyi*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — By *Miss Minnie Bronson*
Woman's Rights vs. Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Woman Suffrage Means Debasement Not Only of Women but of Men — *Mr. John R. Dos Passos*
New Zealand and Australia from an Anti-Suffrage Point of View
The Voice of the People
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

On Suffrage (0.5) — *G. K. Chesterton*
Votes for Women (10c.) — *Frederic Harrison*
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Tayler*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida Tarbell*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) — *E. S. Martin*
The Response of Woman (40c.) — *Arthur W. Robinson, D.D.*
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

Anti-Suffrage Calendar for 1911, with many interesting quotations. These can be obtained by applying to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

We recommend to our readers the new Monthly, THE COMMON CAUSE, which is opposed to Socialism. Subscription $2.00. Office, 154 East 23d Street, N. Y. Also, THE REMONSTRANCE; subscription, 50 cents; 687 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Argument Before Committee — *Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcraft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
The Wage-earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and Not to Men
Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage
In Opposition to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (a List of Massachusetts Men)
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street, BOSTON, MASS.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1913

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....